REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action of October 14, 2005, the Applicant submits this Reply. In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1-14 remain in this application, of which claims 1, 7 and 10 are independent. Dependent claims 13 and 14 are new. No fee is due for claims for this amendment.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-5, of which claim 1 is independent, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 in view of U.S. Patent 5,659,793 ("Escobar"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

According to Escobar, an editing system has a user interface that includes "[t]ime lines 140, 141, 150, 151 and 160 [which] are represented as a plurality of tracks." Col. 6, lines 22-23. "At least two video tracks . . . are preferred." Col. 6, lines 23-24. "At least one interactive object track 160 should be included . . ." Col. 6, lines 26-27. "Separate directories or 'bins' are preferably maintained for video objects, audio objects, text/graphical objects, special effects, program objects and applications." Col. 6, lines 55-58. These assets are stored in "files . . . in industry standard format" such as "open media framework [OMF] format." Col. 7, lines 52-55. Properties for an object in a bin may be specified through a template. See Col. 9, lines 20-45. In the user interface, a "[b]utton 173 invokes application creation or editing functions which permit objects to be assembled into applications with relative timing specified by their placement along the timeline tracks." Col. 6, 37-40. A "[b]utton 172 invokes the editing of objects to permit changes in their properties such as duration." Col. 6, lines 36-37. A "[b]utton 171 . . . permits creation of placeholder objects." Col. 6, lines 32 and 35-36. An asset may have an associated time code that "allows an edit point to be defined as a certain duration from a clearly delineated starting point for asset playback." Col. 8, lines 16-18. Thus, "portions of an asset . . . can be specified in terms of starting and ending time or starting time and duration." Col. 8, lines 19-21.

According to Escobar, to author a program, "[a] user selects one icon for placement on the timeline . . .." Col. 10, lines 18-19. "The user also selects the timeline track on which the icon is to be placed." Col. 10, lines 19-20. "The user then drags and drops a copy of the icon onto the selected timeline track at the start time desired and makes any adjustment in starting time necessary . . .." Col. 10, lines 21-23. "[A] pointer to the object identified by the icon is

stored in a linked list for the selected timeline track at a location determined by its start time."
Col. 10, lines 24-26.

Regarding claim 1, in the Final Office Action it is asserted that Escobar teaches the claimed "means for allowing a user to place interactive content on the at least one interactive track according to a selection of whether the interactive content is associated with either a point in time with a locator object or a duration with a source clip object on the at least one interactive track." The Final Office Action compares this limitation to Escobar, col. 8, lines 15-21 and col. 6, lines 30-41, noted above. In particular, the Final Office Action states (page 14, para. 8, lines 9-11) that "Escobar's method of placing objects to associate them with a point in time is equivalent to a locator object, because both are specified by a point in time on the time line." Applicant respectfully disagrees. The cited portions of Escobar do not refer to "placing objects to associate them with a point in time" but rather says a. "editing functions which permit objects to be assembled into applications *with relative timing specified by their placement along the timeline tracks*" (Col. 6, lines 37-40) and b. "portions of an asset . . . can be specified in terms of *starting and ending time or starting time and duration*" (Col. 8, lines 19-21). Thus, in the excerpts referenced by the Office Action, Escobar teaches that an interactive object has a duration, specified either by a starting time and a duration or by starting and ending times.

Moreover, this application of Escobar to the claims does not address the limitation that placement of interactive content on an interactive track is made according to a selection of whether interactive content is associated with a point in time (with a locator object) or with a duration (with a source clip). The claims have been amended to clarify the distinction between a locator object and a source clip object (based on page 8, lines 23-26 of the specification). The cited portions of Escobar fail to teach this distinction between a locator object and a source clip object.

Accordingly the rejection of independent claim 1 is traversed. The remaining claims 2-5 and 13 (as well as 6, discussed below) are dependent claims that are allowable for at least similar reasons.

In addition, dependent claim 2 includes limitations similar to claim 7 (discussed below) and is allowable for at least similar reasons.

In addition, claim 5 recites that "information about the placement of the interactive content [is stored] as an attribute of the object used to represent the interactive content." Escobar does not appear to teach this limitation.

In addition, new claim 13 recites that this information about the placement of the interactive content is "updat[ed] . . . in response to editing of the placement of the interactive content on the at least one interactive track." Escobar also does not appear to teach this limitation.

Rejection of Claims 7-9 Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 7-9, of which claim 7 is independent, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of Escobar and U.S. Patent 6,324,335 ("Kanda"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Escobar is discussed above in connection with claim 1.

The Final Office Action asserts that Escobar does not explicitly teach editing placement on the interactive track after creation. See Final Office Action, page 13, lines 11-13. The Final Office Action relies instead upon Kanda for teaching editing both the length and position of the clip. See Final Office Action, page 13, lines 1-3 and Kanda Col. 14, lines 26-61 and Fig. 5. Kanda is relied upon solely for this point.

In view of Escobar, Col. 10, line 23, Escobar does teach making an adjustment to the starting time of an object on the time line, thus the reliance on Kanda appears unnecessary.

In the Applicant's prior Reply, it was not argued that Escobar does not teach editing placement of the interactive content on the interactive track. Instead claim 7 was previously amended to recite both a. a "means for allowing a user to edit placement of the interactive content on the at least one interactive track" and b. the means for updating information about the interactive content in the bin using the unique reference, updates this information "in response to editing of the placement of the interactive content on the at least one interactive track." This amendment has been corrected in this Reply to indicate that the information is updated "in response to a user invoking a refresh operation."

In contrast, Escobar permits the properties of an object in a bin to be edited through a properties template which is invoked by selecting the object in the bin. Escobar does not teach that these properties are updated by accessing the interactive content in response to a user invoking a refresh operation.

Claim 7 has been further amended to clarify this distinction. In particular, the "interactive content is represented by an object in the bin, wherein the object is associated with a unique reference to the interactive content, and wherein information describing the interactive content is stored as an attribute of the object," and "the information describing the interactive content stored as an attribute of the object in the bin [is updated] by accessing the interactive content using the unique reference in response to the user invoking a refresh operation." See at least page 7, lines 1-5 and page 10, line 9-32 of this application for support for these limitations. Neither Kanda nor Escobar nor their proposed combination appears to teach these limitations.

Accordingly the rejection of independent claim 7 is traversed. The remaining claims 8-9 and 14 are dependent claims that are allowable for at least similar reasons. In addition, new dependent claim 14 has limitations similar to claims 5 and 13 and is allowable for at least similar reasons.

Rejection of Claims 6 and 10-12 Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 6 and 10-12, of which claim 10 is independent, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of Escobar and U.S. Patent 6,195,497 ("Nagasaka"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Escobar is discussed above.

According to Nagasaka, a "motion picture can be expressed as a whole by a three-dimensional space comprising an x-y plane forming the frame image and the axis of the time t, and the appearing period and the appearing position of the subject can be regarded as its partial space." Col. 7, lines 39-43. Thus, Nagasaka is understood as teaching that a subject in a video is indexed by indicating where the subject appears in this x-y-t space. The Final Office Action appears to state that the x,y plane is being interpreted as the "size" of the video and the "position" of the video is treated as a position in time, represented by time t.

Assuming, for the sake of argument, that Nagasaka teaches that a video frame has x,y data defining its size and a position t time, and would have been combined with Escobar, the claims as amended distinguish from the proposed combination of Escobar and Nagasaka.

In particular, claim 10 as amended indicates that interactive content includes "information to be displayed in a display with the video from the at least one track for video, and a specification of size and spatial position of the video relative to the information to be displayed in the display." Dependent claim 6 was similarly amended. See at least page 1, lines 1-7, Fig. 1,

Fig. 2B and page 10, lines 1-8 of this application for support for these limitations. The proposed combination of Escobar and Nagasaka does not teach these limitations.

Accordingly the rejection of independent claim 10 is traversed. The remaining claims 11 and 12 are dependent claims that are allowable for at least similar reasons.

With respect to claim 6, claim 6 is allowable at least for similar reasons as claim 1 from which it depends. In addition, claim 6 has limitations similar to claim 10 and is allowable for at least similar reasons.

New Claims

New dependent claims 13 and 14 have been added. Their patentability over the art of record was discussed above. These claims are supported in the specification at least by original claim 5, the summary on page 1, lines 25-27, page 4, lines 9-11 and page 9, lines 2-5.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this reply, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, please charge any fee to **Deposit Account No. 50-0876**.

Respectfully submitted,

Avid Technology, Inc.

By _____
Peter J. Gordon
Registration No. 35,164
Avid Technology, Inc.
One Park West
Tewksbury, MA 01876
Tel.: (978) 640-6789